

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION WORKING GROUP
REGULAR MEETING

Held electronically pursuant to Emergency Ordinance adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 24, 2020. The meeting shall have a live audio and video broadcast accessible through the County website www.jamescitycountyva.gov and public access cable channel television 48. Citizen comments may be submitted via US Mail to the Planning Commission Secretary, PO Box 8784, Williamsburg, VA 23187, via electronic mail to community.development@jamescitycountyva.gov, or by leaving a message at 757-253-6750.

April 6, 2020
4:00 P.M.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rich Krapf called the meeting to order at approximately 4:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present:

Jack Haldeman
Rich Krapf
Julia Leverenz
Barbara Null
Tim O'Connor
Frank Polster
Rob Rose

Absent:

Glen Carter

Staff:

Paul Holt, Director of Community Development
Tammy Rosario, Assistant Director of Community Development
Tom Leininger, Planner

Other:

Vlad Gavrilovic, EPR
Todd Gordon, EPR
Leigh Anne King, Clarion Associates
David Henning, Clarion Associates

II. MINUTES

1. February 3, 2020 Minutes

Mr. Jack Haldeman made a motion to Approve the February 3, 2020, meeting minutes.

The motion passed 7-0.

III. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that it was the third meeting of the Planning Commission Working Group (PCWG) for the Comprehensive Plan update process. She stated that the objective of the meeting would be to get input and affirmation for the draft scenario narrative.

1. Comparing County Goals and Public Input Themes

Ms. Rosario stated that the Engage 2045 process emphasizes public engagement. She reviewed the goals that were part of the Towards 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Leigh Anne King reviewed the goals and public input themes from the 2035 Strategic Plan.

Ms. Rosario explained the relationships between the goals and public input themes from the 2035 Strategic Plan and the Towards 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

2. Building the Draft Scenario Narratives

Mr. Vlad Gavrilovic stated that scenario planning would help the County understand the implications of different land use and related policy directions. He stated that there were two suggested scenarios. He stated that one would be a continuation of present trends and the other scenario would be guided by public input.

Ms. King presented the draft potential scenario themes for the existing trend scenario and the public input scenario. She stated that the existing trend scenario themes were based on current land use trends. She stated that the public input scenario themes included greater protection for rural lands and a focus on infill developments, redevelopment and economic development within the Primary Service Area (PSA).

Ms. Julia Leverenz asked how the categories listed in the draft potential scenario themes were related to the public input themes.

Ms. King stated that themes listed in each category were from the public input themes while the categories were just grouping the themes.

Ms. Leverenz stated that the connections between the public input themes and the categories should be identified so that the PCWG can ensure that all the public input themes are accounted for.

Mr. Frank Polster agreed.

3. Developing Performance Indicators

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that the scenarios will be tested using performance indicators. He stated that they will be testing how well the scenarios meet the County's goals reflected in the public input themes. He presented a list of performance indicators for each of the public input themes. He presented an example of how the scenario narratives will be translated into models. He presented examples of how the scenarios can be compared based on the performance indicators. He stated that the comparisons will show the fiscal, land use and transportation impacts of the scenarios.

Mr. Polster asked if the scenarios would change the place types from the current land use

designations shown on the Towards 2035 Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that the scenario that is based on present trends would use place types that correspond to existing land use designations and that the scenario based on public input could alter place types.

4. Next Steps

Ms. Rosario stated that the County is currently in the second phase of the comprehensive plan update process. She stated that a public input event would be held in the summer to get feedback on the results of the scenarios. She stated that the PCWG could ask further questions related to the scenario modeling process. She stated that they would take time at the end of the meeting to ask a set of questions to the PCWG.

Mr. Krapf stated that the maps created from the scenarios will be helpful for the process.

Mr. Rob Rose asked if there had been any discussion of promoting carbon neutrality and renewable energy sources as part of protecting the natural environment.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that some public input had been received related to those ideas. He stated that performance indicators could be created related to renewable energy sources and that carbon neutrality could be addressed through the transportation model.

Mr. Polster asked how the scenarios would account for the future demand and supply of affordable housing.

Ms. King stated that those questions may be addressed through the fiscal impact model.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that the fiscal impact model would use current costs. He stated that the scenario based on public input could include additional affordable housing which would be entered into the fiscal impact model.

Mr. Polster asked if the models would account for the effects of impervious surfaces on watersheds.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that the models would consider the overall impervious areas of each watershed but would not be a precise tool for measuring the impacts of specific developments.

Mr. Tim O'Connor stated that it is important to have a consistent definition for rural lands. He asked what areas were considered to be rural lands in the information that had been presented.

Ms. King stated that rural lands are generally outside of the PSA.

Ms. Rosario stated that it would be important to consider if there are any differences in how the planning team defines rural lands and how the public defines rural lands.

Ms. King asked if there were any further discussion.

There were none.

Ms. King stated that there were three discussion topics for the PCWG to respond to.

- Guidance/affirmation from the PCWG on the Process

Mr. Krapf stated that it is a good idea to use the current comprehensive plan as a baseline and compare with public input. He stated that he would like further information about the scenarios and models.

Mr. Haldeman stated that a few of the comprehensive plan goals should be more specific. He stated that they could be looked at once the results of the scenario modeling have been analyzed. He stated that there should be performance indicators for impervious surface, affordable housing and economic development.

Mr. Rose stated that it could be beneficial to have more than two scenarios. He asked if additional scenarios were considered.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that the idea of having two scenarios was to have one to reflect current trends and one to comprehensively address public input themes.

Ms. Leverenz stated that linkages should be clearly shown between public input themes and performance indicators.

Ms. Barbara Null agreed.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the two proposed scenarios would not address potential future development trends. He stated that higher density housing developments are rising in popularity and could be important to address affordable housing.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that the models could incorporate development best practices that fit the County.

Mr. Polster stated that it was important to trace the public input themes throughout the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that it is important to explain the limitations of the models to the public.

- Guidance/affirmation from the PCWG on the Draft Scenario Narratives – do they ask the questions we want answered?

Mr. Krapf stated that many of the answers to the first question were relevant to the second question.

Mr. Polster stated that the draft performance indicators would not entirely show if the public input themes were achieved.

Ms. Leverenz stated that the goals from the Towards 2035 Comprehensive Plan were being carried forward, but it might make more sense to start with the public input themes as the goals.

Mr. Haldeman stated that some of the goals from the Towards 2035 Comprehensive Plan should be improved.

Mr. Polster stated that linkages should be established between the strategic plan and the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Krapf stated that using the goals from the Towards 2035 Comprehensive Plan will allow citizens to compare against the public input themes.

Ms. Rosario stated that the goals could be reevaluated using public input.

Ms. King stated that validating the public input themes and scenario narratives at a public meeting would help in evaluating the goals.

Mr. Polster asked what the timeline was to present the materials to the public.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that public meetings will be held in the summer and fall.

- Any other guidance on what questions we want to ask the public about the Scenarios this summer?

Mr. O'Connor stated that there should be public input about the importance of high-quality education.

Ms. King stated that education could be considered when reviewing the goals.

IV. OTHER ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

Mr. Krapf asked if there was any further discussion.

There was none.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Leverenz made a motion to Adjourn. The motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Haldeman adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:20 p.m.